Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/591,788	VINOGRADOVA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew O. Savage	1797
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Matthew O. Savage</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Michael Fainberg</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>14 October 2009</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: 1-4		
Prior art documents discussed: Hofmann et al, Edwards et al		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
(2	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to amend claim 1 to patently distinguish over Hofmann et al and Edwards et al, the added claim language having basis in FIG. 2, the second and third full paragraphs on page 4 of the specification, and the paragraph at the bottom of page 6 of the specification. Agreed to amend claims 2 and 4 to correspond to changes made to claim 1. Agreed to amend the specification so as to correspond with the claims. See the attached examiner's amendment for details.